UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,540	03/31/2004	Leo Tat Man Lau	CA920030106US1	9987
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 09/24/200 ON. PLLC	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSY	LVANIA AVENUE, N	HO, BINH VAN		
SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2163	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/24/2008	PAPER

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/816,540	LAU ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
BINH V. HO	2163	

	BINH V. HO	2163				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>10 September 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	FOR ALLOWANCE.				
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, wwith 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.			
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extra under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the size forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of			
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
AMENDMENTS						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	sideration and/or search (see NO		cause			
(c) They have the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	•	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for			
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		(				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allownon-allowable claim(s).	·	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the			
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,4,5,7-9 and 11-17. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		I be entered and an e	xplanation of			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
	/Wilson Lee/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 2163				

Continuation of 13. Other: On page 8 of the Remarks:

## Item#1

Applicant stated "As a preliminary matter, Applicants submit that since claim 5 was not previously amended in response to the previous Office Action of December 11, 2007, and since the Examiner is applying a new grounds of rejection, the finality of the rejection is improper."

Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant, since Under present practice, second or any subsequent actions on the merits shall be final, except where the examiner introduces a new ground of rejection that is neither necessitated by applicant's amendment of the claims. Since the current rejection is indeed necessitated by applicant's amendment, therefore the Final Office Action is proper.

## Item#2

Applicant stated "During an interview conducted on August 29, 2008, the Examiner agreed that the finality of the Office Action was improper and agreed to treat the instant Office Action as a non-final Office Action."

Examiner believes that Applicant misunderstood Examiner's comment. Examiner has NEVER agreed that the Final Office Action was improper, and NEVER agreed to treat the Office Action dated 7/10/08 as Non Final Office Action. Further, the conversation on August 29, 2008 was not an interview. During the conversation, Examiner suggested Applicant to respond to the Final Office Action, and he stated that he would further consider upon receiving a formal response.